

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1898.

Number 28.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

When La Liberte, of Paris, asks if the Spanish have done worse in Cuba and the Philippines than the United States in its treatment of the Indians, exactly what shall we reply?

To students of American political history, it has long been evident that the imperialism of Alexander Hamilton has revived in the later triumphs of the republican party. It was not to be expected, though, that the licensed spell-binder of the party would admit the fact. Yet Chauncey Depew, in his speech at Chicago before the Hamilton club, has not only admitted it but gloried in it. This hour on the dial of American history, he said, is Hamilton's. Unhappily that is true. The imperial policy of Hamilton, which burned out early in the century in the bright flames of Jeffersonian democracy, rises up again from its own ashes as the century draws to a close. Its peculiar manifestations then, were the hateful and hated alien and sedition laws; its peculiar manifestations now, are the fostering of monopolies at home and the grabbing of land abroad. Now as then its spirit menaces popular liberty. That Hamiltonism has been resurrected and that the republican party is its guardian angel, is true enough; but it is surprising that the chief trumpeter of the party should joyfully proclaim the deplorable fact.

Our efforts to grab Cuba are not flourishing at all satisfactorily. Not only are the plutocratic yarns about the Cubans exposed, but the natives generally and the resident Spaniards are joining with the Cubans in de-

manding self-government for the island. "The Spanish publicists," at Havana, says an American correspondent, "have taken up the cudgels for independence," with the rallying cry of "Cuba for the Cubans!" And "political clubs are forming all over the city," composed of recent enemies of the insurgents, to oppose annexation. This movement has been met in friendly spirit by the Cuban insurgents; and as Havana was but recently the center of annexation sentiment, it is reasonable to infer that the general movement for independence will spread over the island if it has not already done so. In that case, the administration will need more than 50,000 troops if subjugation is intended.

One by one the accusations of the summer made against the Cubans in order to create an impression that they are unfit for self-government, have been thrown out of court. Not one of them now holds good. At first the Cubans were accused of diabolically slaughtering Cervera's men after their surrender. It was this that put them out of the pale of civilization, according to that expert in civilization—Harpér's Weekly. But Cervera put a quietus upon that accusation, when he told of the kind treatment he and his men had received as prisoners in the hands of the Cubans. The fact was, as now established, that when the Cubans fired upon Cervera's men, the latter were endeavoring to escape to Santiago, and that as soon as they surrendered they were treated by the Cubans, to whom the surrender was made, with all the consideration due to prisoners of war. It was further charged that the Cubans were thieves, because they picked up the impedimenta which American soldiers had thrown away. Gen. Wheeler disposes of this charge by explaining that the Cubans had every reason to

suppose that the blankets and the clothing the American soldiers had dropped were abandoned deliberately and finally. Then there was Shafter's accusation that the Cubans were useless in his campaign because Gen. Garcia failed to keep Spanish reinforcements out of Santiago. This accusation, too, the only official one, now goes the way of the others. For Gen. Miles, in a recent interview, says of Garcia: "At my personal request he cheerfully undertook the task of keeping certain Spanish forces from joining the Spanish troops in Santiago," and "he succeeded so well that only a small detachment got into Santiago before it surrendered to Gen. Shafter." So the only reason left for denying the right of self-government to the Cubans is that we don't want them to have it. And wasn't that probably the reason lying back of all the false statements that were circulated to their disparagement?

In the midst of her preparations for a universal peace conference, Russia makes shrewd preparations for possible war. Four battleships and 40 torpedo boats and torpedo boat destroyers are in process of construction in Russian navy yards, and work upon them is being rushed day and night; while every Sunday the Czar in person witnesses the naval maneuvers with keen delight, and the annual call for 200,000 men for the army has just been issued a month earlier than usual. The same dispatch that brings this information from Cracow says that the Russian papers are forbidden to publish any news whatever of the movements of the fleet or of military and naval operations. There's the rub! If Russia would couple with her propositions for disarmament a pledge to make the press free, some confidence might be reposed in her astonishing peace proposition. Then, if

disarmament took place, there would be no opportunity for Russia to strengthen herself as a military power secretly. But with the press strangled, disarmament might very well be but a prelude to the fruition of Russia's long-cherished plans for the conquest of the world.

It need not be supposed that treachery is contemplated by the Czar. He is probably too unsophisticated for that. But the Czar of Russia is only a puppet in the hands of an oligarchy. He could no more have made the disarmament proposition without the consent of his nobles, than the Emperor of China could carry out his reforms against the will of the dowager and her party. The Czar's proposition, therefore, is the proposition of the nobles, and such a proposition from them is suspicious. Let Russia free the press, so that her movements at home may be known to the world, if she wishes to be taken seriously. He who looks for universal peace from this source, under these circumstances, must be credulous indeed if he means the peace of brotherhood. The peace that the Russian oligarchy would give mankind is the peace that reigned in Warsaw under the same auspices.

At an immense gathering of the supporters of James G. Maguire, at Los Angeles, Cal., last month, a Maguire club of colored men from the neighboring town of Pasadena joined the procession, carrying a banner with this device: "We are Lincoln republicans, not Hanna republicans." These colored men might teach their brother republicans a valuable lesson. It is impossible, upon considering the career of Abraham Lincoln, to think of him as a confederate of Mark Hanna. He would have seemed so out of place. Sincere republicans should know, and thoughtful ones will understand, that when their party is attacked it is not because of its underlying principles nor of its history, but because in its later days it has experi-

enced the misfortune of the man whom the Samaritan succored on the Jericho road.

In opposing Maguire's candidacy in California, the monopolists have resorted to their now familiar trick of organizing their employes so as to vote them in blocks for monopoly interests. Here is an extract from the circular of the railroad clubs that are being organized:

If we, as railway employes, do not unite for our common defense, and the day should come when our wages are reduced, as a result of our indifference to the material welfare of our employers and ourselves, the responsibility will rest largely with ourselves." Circulars of this kind are calculated to intimidate, and they often succeed. They did in 1896. But they will fail as soon as railway employes begin to reflect.

Railroad corporations have two kinds of incomes—earnings and stealings. It is only out of the former that employes are paid. They never get any share in the stealings. Monopoly politicians are the only outsiders who share in that fund. Consequently, no matter how great the stealings of railroad corporations, employes get no better wages; and no matter to what extent the stealings are cut down, employes get no lower wages. The stealings of railroad corporations might be reduced to zero, and yet wages would not fall a penny's worth. Then why should railway employes vote in favor of railway stealing? Why not confine the income of railroad corporations to what the railroads earn?

In one of his speeches while en route to Omaha, President McKinley declared that "we have gone from labor seeking employment to employment seeking labor." Employment seeking labor! Where is employment seeking labor, except at reduced wages? Has not one of Mr. McKinley's own organs, the Iron Trade Review, said that "wage reductions are certainly a feature of the new prosperity"? and is it not obvious that this

is true. Had he been perfectly candid, Mr. McKinley would have said that "we have gone from labor seeking employment at old wages to employment seeking labor at lower wages?"

In an editorial in his paper, the Lewiston Journal, Mr. Dingley predicts that in consequence of the Dingley bill, the next 12 months will be a veritable marvel of prosperity. This remarkable editorial, which appeared as late as September 10, 1898, closes with a cheerful admonition to everybody to "prepare for the return of business." But didn't Mr. Dingley and his crowd tell everybody to prepare for the return of business immediately upon Mr. McKinley's election, and didn't those who prepared find themselves egregiously sold? Didn't the Dingley crowd then say that the return of business would take place upon Mr. McKinley's inauguration, and didn't they then have to postpone the date until the signing of the Dingley bill? The Dingley bill was signed more than a year ago, and yet again Mr. Dingley urges everybody to "prepare for the return of business." How long is this farce to be kept up? For two years all who have said from time to time that business hadn't returned, have been denounced as calamity howlers; but from time to time admissions like this of Mr. Dingley's, testify that the "calamity howlers" have told the truth. Even Mr. Dingley's latest prediction has yet to show indications of verification. Business is worse now, if the business journals are to be trusted, than it was when that prediction was made.

From Wilson's Financial Catechism, a book intended to instruct farmers in the mysteries of finance, we learn that wealth consists of "the soil and its natural resources as furnished by the hand of the Creator, with the accumulation of its products developed, improved and made useful and valuable by the ingenuity, skill and industry of mankind." If Mr. Wilson's analytical powers play

such tricks upon him in the intricacies of finance as in this simple first principle of the nature of wealth, the Lord have mercy on the intelligence of the farmers whom he teaches! Not that we object to his distinguishing the soil and its natural resources by the term "wealth," if he wishes to. That is as good a name, perhaps, as any other. But when he undertakes by the same term to distinguish products, he doesn't distinguish at all. He might as well say that "cattle" consist of cows, together with their accumulated products of milk, butter and cheese, as to say that wealth consists of the soil together with its products.

The president's committee for investigating the mismanagement of the war jogs along cheerily, with what is rapidly showing itself to be a neat whitewashing job. Complaints of mismanagement laid before the committee, instead of being made the basis of a search for proof, are used for the purpose of drawing out general denials from friendly witnesses. For example, the Rev. R. Heber Newton had made serious charges regarding the management of Camp Wikoff. These were laid before the committee, and here is the use the committee made of them: Said Mr. Beaver, questioner-in-chief for the committee, to Gen. Wheeler, the witness, after reading Newton's charges to him, "Might it not be that a civilian, and particularly a gentleman of the standing of Dr. Newton, who has been in the habit of visiting the best hospitals of the world, might be impressed with a tent hospital lacking some facilities? Is it not possible that he would regard conditions as unfavorable, which a soldier of your experience would regard as more than ordinarily satisfactory from the standpoint of a soldier in camp?" Gen. Wheeler thought so, and Heber Newton and his charges were duly squelched. Another of the many indications of the animus of the committee may be observed in this question of the medical member: "Could

all the medical men and all the medicines in the world, in your opinion, have prevented the outbreak of sickness at Santiago?"

It is perfectly evident that the president's committee understands its business to be not to fix responsibility for the notorious mismanagement, but to make it appear if possible that there was no mismanagement. Its purpose is not to search out guilt, but to exonerate. Not only are the questions largely of the kind quoted above, but there is no cross-examination worthy the name. Though Gen. Wheeler's testimony was almost wholly negative—that is, after the manner of the Irishman's flood of witnesses, who put to shame the one witness who swore to seeing an accident by swearing that they didn't see it—but he was subjected to no questions at all calculated to probe his knowledge or lack of knowledge. His "cheery optimism," as some one has called his testimony, was allowed to pass for real evidence. Gen. Wheeler certainly is both cheerful and optimistic. He has reason to be. His native good feeling was stimulated by an interview with the president, who, he said, treated him so kindly that he could never forget it; and this was followed by the promotion of his young son, a recent graduate of West Point, over the heads of 1,706 older and more experienced army officers.

The strictures we have made upon the good faith of the administration in connection with investigating the war scandals do not rest upon our judgment alone. For this very bad faith, amounting so nearly to hypocrisy that the difference is not easily distinguished, the administration is being scored by its own supporters. By way of illustration, here is an editorial from the issue of October 8 of one of the most ardent advocates of McKinley's election, the New York Evening Post:

The whitewashing investigation of the war department, by a commission containing two or three men who said beforehand that there was nothing in

the charges, and one man whose son had received a most desirable appointment in the army, is already seen to be such a farce that even republican congressmen treat it as worthless and promise to force an inquiry that will really find out something. Representative Lawrence, of Massachusetts, in a speech to the convention which re-nominated him the other day, after paying a warm tribute to the soldiers, said that "they deserved at the hands of the government they so unselfishly served anxious and tender care," and, after a reference to the present sham inquiry at Washington, made this explicit announcement and promise: "I am in favor of an investigation which shall investigate; which shall place the responsibility—let the blow fall where it will. The people of western Massachusetts demand it. It is their right, and I pledge my efforts to that end."

From Tokyo, in far-away Japan, there comes to us a little book by an American missionary, the Rev. Charles E. Garst, entitled "A Great Economic Equation." It aims to co-ordinate the principles of individualism and socialism. The key note of the book is struck by the assertion that "individual righteousness and social unrighteousness cannot co-exist." In explanation of this Mr. Garst says: "Individual purity in the midst of social impurity, is much like household purity without a sewer system, in a great city." Mr. Garst's little book is a helpful contribution to economic discussion.

Too little attention has been paid to the instance of mistaken identity which the discovery a few weeks ago of a mutilated body at Bridgeport, Conn., afforded. It is a whole commentary on a fatal facility of judges and juries in a certain class of murder cases. In the Bridgeport case the dismembered trunk of an unknown woman had been found, and a resident of Middleboro, Mass., identified it as that of his daughter, Grace Perkins, who had recently disappeared. The identification was made by means of birthmarks and body scars, for the face was unrecognizable. But so positive was Mr. Perkins, that he expressed his willingness to stake his life upon his identification; and he was corrob-

erated by a dentist who had filled Miss Perkins's teeth, and whose description of the fillings tallied with those in the mouth of the dead girl. The body was accordingly given over to Mr. Perkins for burial, and steps were taken by the police to implicate some acquaintance of his daughter's who might possibly have had reason for covering up the crime. But circumstances did not happen to favor this consummation. Soon after the positively identified remains of Miss Perkins arrived at her father's home, Miss Perkins herself, full of life and spirit and accompanied by a husband—a brand new acquisition—with whom she had gone upon a wedding trip, stepped off the cars into the midst of her own funeral. It is easy to imagine what might have happened to that young husband had his wife happened to go crazy and wander away, leaving him with dumb lips to explain to an angered father and an outraged community, why he had taken Miss Perkins's life and mangled her remains. Surely this Bridgeport case ought to serve in some sort as a lesson in future cases of mysterious homicide.

Some anonymous writer from London to an American daily paper, caps the climax of transcendental absurdity in setting forth his views as to the cure of poverty. Confronted in London with the awful condition of the "submerged classes," he finds in that condition an excuse for what he calls "Mr. Henry George's apparent extravagance when he declared it to be his deliberate opinion that 'if, standing on the threshold of being, one were given the choice of entering life as a Terra del Fuego, a black fellow of Australia, an Eskimo in the arctic circle, or among the lowest classes in such a highly civilized country as Great Britain, he would make infinitely the better choice in selecting the lot of the savage.'" But this anonymous correspondent is a hard headed man. He is not to be beguiled in his search for a remedy for poverty, by any "moonbeams of an Utopian shad-

owland." It is no affair for party treatment; it is nothing that can be accomplished by legislation. It will not be accomplished by socialism, nor by theoretical anarchy, nor by nationalized railways, nor by nationalized land. What then will it be accomplished by? Ah! It will be accomplished by "nationalized sympathy!" That, of course, is no moonbeam from shadowland! And this soft hearted but extraordinarily hard headed proposition of our anonymous friend is followed by its author with a lot of pietistic cant about the Christian duty of dividing up with the poor.

But is it true that the extirpation of poverty cannot be accomplished by legislation? Why not, if upon examination poverty proves to be caused by legislation? When legislation maintains conditions under which producers are forced to pay tribute out of their earnings to men who to that extent earn nothing, and opportunities for each to abolish his own poverty without impoverishing others are diminished, the poverty caused by those conditions certainly could be abolished by counter-legislation. In thus referring the cause of poverty to the legal maintenance of parasitical conditions, we have touched the question at the core. Voluntary poverty there might be, irrespective of legislation; but without plutocratic legislation involuntary poverty cannot be. Poverty is the result of nothing but a subtle form of slavery, and any "nationalized sympathy" that stopped short of justice, could no more do away with it than it could do away with other forms of slavery. Isn't it interesting, though, to note how your pietistic canter, when his conscience is touched, snuggles up to such vaguenesses as "nationalized sympathy," but shies off from anything as robust as simple justice.

President McKinley is reported from Washington as deriving extraordinary gratification from the success of the tin plate provisions of his tariff bill. Mr. McKinley's capacity, for

gratification appears to be one of his deformities. To the extent that the tin plate policy has been a success at all, its success has been in the direction of impoverishing Welsh workmen, of driving some of them from their homes to this country to find employment at their trade, of lowering wages in the trade here, and of building up an American trust in tin plate manufacture. The only persons besides Mr. McKinley who are peculiarly gratified at this are the members of the tin plate ring.

#### THE NEW AMERICAN ARISTOCRACY.

Professor Harry Thurston Peck, of Columbia University, is a writer of unusual force and pith and betrays a certain liberality, generosity and largeness of conception quite remarkable when he deals with literary subjects. But when his notions of government and social structure crop out, as they often do in the *Bookman*, of which he is editor, and other magazines, he appears thoroughly illiberal and medieval.

The modern theory of social and political equality, Prof. Peck regards as particularly unsound and incompatible with a stable and prosperous community. The one thing which this country needs to give it stability, dignity and standing among nations is an aristocracy, and in his article in the October number of the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, he welcomes indications in which he sees that this want is about to be at length supplied. The American people have been learning something; they know a good thing when they see it, and they have the faculty of getting the best that is going. They have lately determined to have an Aristocracy, and they will not put up with an inferior article, for they have already tried several of that kind.

With admirable grasp and perspicacity the professor shows how the theocratic aristocracy of the early days in New England, broadened until it ceased to exist; how the feudal landed aristocracy of the South disappeared with the expansion of our national life; and how the more recent self-constituted plutocracy cannot obtain recognition, because it is

vulgar, selfish and unpatriotic. So far, we have made shift to get along without an aristocracy that was at all worth while. But that sort of thing must not go on too long. That "no nation ever reached a high degree of political power and national prosperity without developing some form of class distinction" is, he says, a "political axiom."

Fortunately, people with money are beginning to study the arts and refinements of social distinctiveness, and, more important still, "to men of wealth and leisure, the field of politics seems to have become of late far more attractive than it appeared some years ago." And we are about to have "an aristocracy in the best and highest meaning of the word," which will "give the state a class of men distinguished, highly cultivated and intelligent."

Such an aristocracy would foster art and learning, smooth down national angularities, "establish noble charities," and in general "confer a lasting benefit upon the nation."

It would be in order to inquire whether Prof. Peck's political axiom really has general acceptance, or is merely a dogma of his, requiring proof; whether the class distinctions which have always developed with nations were a cause of such development, or a cause of the subsequent decay which has usually followed the increasing emphasis of such class distinctions. It could be as truthfully said that no nation ever "reached a high degree of political power and national prosperity" without developing some form of political corruption.

But that is not necessary, to show the fallacy of his position. As a student of history he ought to know that there never was an aristocracy such as he hopes for. There never was, and never can be, an aristocracy of culture, or intellect, or wealth. There can only be an aristocracy of Force. It may have, for its outward and visible sign and its instrument, wealth, or land, or traditional rank, but after all it is mere force, applied in these several different ways. Prof. Peck himself says that no aristocracy can be of any consequence unless it obtain approval from the general pub-

lic. Its little assumptions of superiority, its vanities and ambitions, are entirely futile and fruitless, and it cannot even take itself seriously, without popular recognition. But no such recognition has ever yet been obtained and held except by force. Whether the force be political, or military, or theocratic, or what not, it is still force.

The aristocracy for which Prof. Peck hopes is not one of mere wealth, but must be one in the "highest and best sense," with superior intelligence, dignity, generosity, patriotism and nobility of character as prerequisites. But how is the noble class to be selected from the body of the people? Who is to determine the individual possessors of the worthy traits which make one eligible? Obviously, only the elect themselves can perform that office of selection. For what can you expect of human nature when one sits down to make a list of those few who are highest endowed with patriotism, generosity and general excellence? Is there anyone who would from that favored class exclude himself? Or those of like ideals and sympathies? Surely, the professor would admit that there is no one. The chosen few must choose themselves, and since everybody elects himself as one of the number, there remains as serious a problem as ever to determine who are actually chosen. Really, it seems that the process of choosing would never be complete, or even fairly begun.

But supposing the choice were accomplished, the maintenance of the distinction would be fraught with equal difficulty. The general recognition would be entirely wanting without the application of force to compel it.

It is true, of course, that people do recognize individual worth. They revere the Washingtons, they defer to the Websters and Choates, they glorify the Grants and Deweys, some of them doff their hats to the Edisons and Clara Bartons. But all that consideration is paid to them as individuals, as their personal due. They are not deferred to as a class, or because they belong to a class. Nor do their relations or associates draw any of the honors paid them because be-

longing to their class. These suffer by comparison rather, in the public estimation. It is a matter of individual excellence, and cannot be made a matter of class excellence, which wins approval.

The New Aristocracy can only establish itself by force, and to those with high character and sense of justice, which are indispensable in its members, force would be quite impossible.

The only aristocracy for which it is possible, then, to secure popular recognition, is the one which Prof. Peck despises: the note-shaving, railroad-gutting, franchise-grabbing gentry. The members of this class, by serious attention to politics, by obtaining control of legislatures so that they can more completely command the natural sources of wealth and monopolize all opportunities, may finally compel not only the deference, but the service of the multitude.

Thus, indeed, can the New American Aristocracy maintain itself in comfortable and complacent excellence, and "establish noble charities" wherewith to beguile itself into the belief that it is really "conferring a lasting benefit upon the nation!"

JOHN TURNER WHITE.

#### A PERSONAL COMPARISON.

Col. Theodore Roosevelt and Col. William J. Bryan have often been compared as men of the same type. This is usually done by people who dislike them both. To a partisan of Roosevelt's, it would be in the highest degree offensive to liken him to Bryan; to a partisan of Bryan's, it would be no less offensive to liken him to Roosevelt. Each is a disagreeable character to the partisans of the other. Yet there is good reason for the comparison. They certainly present to the public eye a striking resemblance.

We suspect, however, that their resemblance is less a resemblance of each to the other, than of Roosevelt as he actually is to Bryan as he has been pictured.

Bryan is habitually described by the republican and the pluto-democratic press, including the professional funny papers, all of which are

bitterly partisan against him, as a self-seeking man.

In his Chicago speech, which rang round the world, this press could see nothing but a bid for the presidential nomination to gratify personal ambition. In his extraordinary round of campaign speeches in behalf of silver coinage, it could detect nothing but overweening ambition supported by a superabundance of animal energy. His courteous telegram to the successful candidate after election, a telegram which at least sounded like a generous expression of patriotic good feeling, was treated as another bid for popular notice, and the reply of scant courtesy as a merited rebuke. When he offered his services to the country without reservation, in any military capacity in which the president thought he might be useful, he was again pictured as a notoriety hunter; and the president, who was at the time appointing callow sons and nephews of political and social favorites to positions in which they have proved more dangerous to our troops than the enemy, was commended for the insulting manner in which he ignored Bryan's offer.

Then, when Bryan enlisted among the volunteers of his state as a private, he was sneeringly described as a man with an itch to get into the muck somehow, for the sake of attracting attention to himself; and when he was chosen by his comrades to be their colonel, the sneers were renewed in aggravated form. At last, when the war was virtually over, when nothing remained to do, except garrison duty in conquered countries which we had no right to subjugate and the subjugation of which was never contemplated as an object or result of the war, when, in other words, the intention of all patriotic enlistments had been accomplished—when this time had come, and Col. Bryan applied for the release of his regiment, or rather, when it was reported, truly or falsely, that he had made such application, a new variety of sneer broke out. He was now a soldier who wished to lay down the sword of war in order to resume the jaw of politics.

An ambitious, self-seeking politician, without political principle, and

restless for notoriety; such is the picture that Bryan's plutocratic enemies have drawn of him. Whether it is a true picture of the man, we shall not now stop to inquire. We have for the present a different purpose in view. What we wish especially to call attention to is the fact that the picture of Bryan as his enemies paint it is a perfect picture of Roosevelt as he paints it himself.

Consider Roosevelt's career. To become a member of the legislature, he pretended for a term to change his residence. His own counsel tells it, by Col. Roosevelt's authorization. And in support of what political principle did he do this? None. There was nothing in the episode to indicate a better motive than personal ambition.

Then he became a reformer in politics. Here was an indication of his possession of political principle in some sort; but, when the reformers were defeated in national convention by the boss, he abandoned his reform associates. His reward came two years later, in the form of a boss's nomination for mayor of New York. This he accepted at a time when, according to the present authorized statement of his lawyer, he was not a resident of New York. What could have been his motive but personal ambition?

Next we find him again pretending to remove to New York so as to accept an appointment as police commissioner, returning to his old residence upon vacating the office. And he vacated it, not because his term had expired, nor because there was not as good work to do there as anywhere, but because he had successfully solicited an office at Washington which, while offering him no greater opportunities for usefulness, did offer opportunities for a more ambitious career. At a critical moment he abandoned that office too, in order to take the field in the spectacular role of the most sensational officer of a spectacular cavalry regiment. Here he made a dashing record. It was just such a record as an ambitious and reckless man overflowing with animal spirits might have been expected to make—just such a record as a magazine article which he had

published two or three years before, indicated his ambitious desire to make.

Largely on account of this record, the independent republicans, regarding him as one of themselves despite his former desertion, hopefully looked to Roosevelt as the man to overthrow boss-ship in the republican party of New York, by running as an independent republican candidate for governor. But that would have savored of fidelity to political principle, and Col. Roosevelt ignored his independent friends to dicker with the boss of New York himself, whereby he became the accredited candidate of the machine. Thus, at the present climax of his career he again subordinates political principle to personal ambition.

Col. Roosevelt has not only never given the slightest indication of any ambition for aught but his own selfish advancement, but he has distinctly shown by his conduct, and though guardedly yet not ambiguously, has at times shown in words, that his own glory is his chief concern in life. Even what he would call his political principles—frequent war to foster the military spirit, expansion of territory to make the nation great, and an enormous navy to make it mighty—are but a magnification of his own personal ambition. He thinks of the nation as his greater self.

All that Bryan is by his meanest political enemies described to be, that is Roosevelt proved to be by Roosevelt himself. His whole career testifies, directly and positively, without reference to the judgment of his enemies, without reference to any motives which he has not himself frankly revealed, that, utterly oblivious of political principle, he is dominated by an intensely personal and selfish ambition.

#### CALIFORNIA FARMERS AND TAXATION.

In the state election now in progress in California the issue is the legitimate interests of the people as a whole against the plundering interests of the combined monopolies.

On the one hand the nomination of Congressman Maguire for governor was forced by the rank and

file of his party at the primaries, so that the democratic bosses, whom as a rule the monopolists control, were powerless to prevent it; on the other hand, the republican nominations were made from top to bottom at the dictation of the monopoly "combine." Maguire is committed, both by his pledges and his record, to clip the claws of the monopolies to the fullest extent of his power if elected, whereas the republican candidate is silent upon that matter.

Monopoly is the issue, but the monopoly managers have tried to shift it to the question of the single tax, hoping thereby to confuse voters.

Now, the single tax is a reform under which all improvements upon land, and all personal property, would be exempt from taxation. It is the reform that was advocated by Henry George during his life time, and which, in his world famous book, called "Progress and Poverty," is fully explained and eloquently defended as the means of protecting from the encroachments of monopoly all those who work, whether in city or country, whether as hired men or as employers. If this reform were adopted, public revenues would be derived exclusively from one kind of tax. This would be levied upon the owners of land—city land and mining land as well as farming land. And it would be levied not in proportion to the area of land, but in proportion to its value as a site, in proportion, that is, to what the land would sell for if its improvements were swept away by fire and cyclone.

This being the nature of the single tax, every intelligent Californian knows that if Judge Maguire were elected governor of California he would have no more power to put it in operation there than in Illinois or Great Britain. Unfortunate as that is for the people of California, and especially unfortunate as it is for California farmers, it is nevertheless the fact. For the constitution of California expressly forbids that kind of taxation; and existing circumstances are such that there is greater probability of California's sliding down the mountains into the Pacific than of Judge Maguire's being able, during one term in office, even to

put the machinery in motion for amending the constitution.

Inasmuch, however, as the republican party of California, under the dictation of those of its managers who are regularly employed by the monopolists, has seen fit to hold the single tax up to the gaze of California farmers as a sort of fiscal monster to excite their fears, they will do well to take advantage of the opportunity to find out exactly how it would operate with reference to their interests. This is something which the farmers must do for themselves. No one can do it for them. All that anyone can honestly do for them is to suggest a line of thought for their candid consideration, and that task we willingly undertake.

As Judge Maguire has said, there are two kinds of farmers, those who farm the farm and those who farm the farmer. The kind that farm farmers might as well understand that the single tax would not promote their peculiar industry; and unless they have minds above plunder, they might as well give the single tax a bad name and done with it. It has nothing in it which they could welcome. But the farmers who farm farms will profit by further examination.

Let the latter class of farmers consider the present tax system of California. That system is intended to make everybody contribute to the public revenues in proportion to the value of the property of all sorts that he owns. But in fact it does nothing of the kind. Like the systems of other states, it allows rich men and great corporations to escape their taxes in enormous degree, and puts the heft of the burden upon farmers.

Attempts to tax personal property must always produce that result. The reason is obvious. The personal property of rich men consists mostly of money, credits, stocks, bonds, and the like, which can be secreted easily; whereas the personal property of farmers consists mostly of crops, cattle, implements, furniture, and the like, which cannot be secreted at all. The rich, therefore, easily escape a very large part of their share of personal property taxation, while farm-

ers not only do not escape their share but are forced to bear in great degree the evaded share of the rich. That being so—and every California farmer who is half alive knows that it is so—the abolition of taxes upon personal property could not hurt farmers. On the contrary, it would help them. They, also, would then be exempt from a burdensome tax from which the rich are virtually exempt already. In connection, therefore, with personal property taxes, the single tax would benefit working farmers, for it would abolish all taxation upon personal property.

Having thus seen that in abolishing personal property taxation, the single tax would not injure but would benefit him, let the working farmer next consider the question of taxes upon real estate improvements.

Is it not true that the fixed improvements upon farms are as a rule worth more than the value of the farming site or location? In other words, do not farming improvements, such as buildings, fences, clearings, drainage where necessary and irrigation in arid places—do not these and kindred improvements cost more as a rule than the bare land would be worth? And is it not also true that in the exceptional cases in which the bare land would be worth more than the improvements, that it is not farmed at all or is poorly farmed? that it is a speculative holding or the great ranch of some rich man who farms farmers instead of farms? or that it is located so near to some city that the land is valuable for lots and ought to be used not for farming but for buildings? There can be but one answer. Not only in California but everywhere else, real farming land, when owned and farmed by real farmers, and properly utilized, is almost if not quite invariably worth less than the fixed improvements upon it.

But how is it with idle farm land held by speculators? how with great ranches owned by monopoly landlords? how with the mines, and with railroad real estate? how with city lots? The reverse is the case with all that kind of property. Great ranches are only slightly improved; they are in the main vast areas of

monopolized virgin soil, the improvements upon which are of little value in comparison with the value of the naked land itself. Land held idle for a rise in value is totally unimproved, and of course all its value is land value. Railroad values are chiefly the value not of buildings or tunnels, of embankments, cuts or rails, but of the bare right of way. With mines, the greatest value is not in the machinery and the timbering, but in the mining opportunity. And as to city lots, though the improvements upon some of the least valuable are worth more than the site, yet in the choicest locations the most costly buildings are worth less than the narrow spaces of land they rest upon; while the value of vacant lots is nothing but land value, and that of those with "shacks" upon them is nearly so.

To abolish taxes on improvements, therefore, would benefit the owners of such property in far less degree than it would benefit working farmers. For their exemptions, in proportion to their land value, would be much less than the exemptions of the farmers.

Thus the single tax, which would abolish taxes on real estate improvements, would be a relief to the working farmer instead of a discrimination against him.

But the single tax does not stop with exempting personal property and real estate improvements from taxation. It shifts the burden of all taxes to the land, measuring the amount of tax in each case not by area but by selling value.

Since so much property would be exempt, the tax on land would of course be increased. But observe how the increase would be distributed. Though working farmers would pay higher taxes for their bare land than they do now, yet inasmuch as their improvements are worth more than their land, they would lose less by that than they would save by the exemption of these improvements, so that their total real estate tax would not be as high as now.

Not so with rich ranchers, with land speculators, with railroad and mining corporations, or with city

landlords. Since their land values are as a rule of greater value than their improvements, their exemption would be less than the increase in their tax; and instead of paying a lower real estate tax than now, they would pay a higher one. The net result would be a shifting back upon corporations, land speculators, and the wealthy of cities, of the burden of taxation which they have been and still are throwing off upon the shoulders of working farmers.

These fiscal advantages of the single tax to farmers are easily seen upon a little thoughtful consideration. But the economic advantages would be still greater. By taxing land values alone and exempting everything else—that is, by taxing monopoly and exempting labor—the single tax would encourage every form of labor and discourage every form of monopoly.

To hold land idle would then be unprofitable, and in consequence everyone who owned land would have to use it to its full capacity. This could not be done without tremendously increasing the demand for workers in every grade of employment, and thereby multiplying demand for the products of the farm. Not only would the single tax lessen the taxes of working farmers, but it would also widen and strengthen the working farmer's market. What that would mean to him, every farmer who for lack of a strong market is compelled to sell his produce at prices which leave him but a bare living, ought to know without being told.

The condition is well understood by the combined monopolies of California, and that is why they fear the single tax. It is not from love of the farmer whom they have plucked so long that they are solicitous, but because in the advent of the single tax they shrewdly see the end of their plucking opportunities.

## NEWS

The coal strike or lockout in central Illinois culminated on the 12th in a riot, in which many persons were killed and wounded. The number has not yet been ascertained. This

riot was not at Pana, the principal seat of the difficulty, but at Virden, in the northeast corner of Macoupin county, a little north of west from Pana, and about 35 miles away. The coal mines at Virden are operated by the Chicago-Virden Coal company. As at Pana, the strike, or more properly the lockout, has been on since last April, and the operators have been importing negroes from Alabama to take the places of the local miners. This importation of labor was the immediate cause of the riot.

The Virden riot will be better understood if we begin the story at the beginning. For mining coal in Illinois, the joint convention of operators and miners had agreed upon a state scale of 40 cents per gross ton. This rate the Virden and Pana operators declared they could not pay, as their mines were unfavorably situated with reference to the coal market. Acknowledging the justice of the operators' claim, the local miners offered to take 35 cents. But the operators were still dissatisfied, and on the 1st of last April they closed their mines. Thereupon the miners appealed to the state board of arbitration to determine a fair scale. The operators refused to join in the appeal. Nevertheless the board investigated the matter and decided that a fair scale would be 33 cents. This decision had no legal value, however, as the operators had refused to join in the arbitration. Neither did it produce any moral effect upon the operators, for they continued to keep the mines closed. Affairs were thus at a standstill and peaceable, until the operators began to import negroes from Alabama, upon representations that mining labor was in great demand at Pana and Virden.

This movement on the part of the operators excited the local miners, the more especially as it was attended with hostile preparations on the part of the operators. A stockade was built around the Virden mines, and armed private detectives were hired and quartered there. From this time on the village of Virden was in a ferment. The local miners armed themselves and declared that the imported negroes should not be taken into the stockade, while the operators, appealing to the sheriff for a posse and to the governor for troops, declared that the negroes should be brought in at any cost.

During the present week F. C. Loucks, president of the Virden Coal company, made a specific demand upon the governor for troops. He did this nominally through the sheriff, but the conversation, which was by telephone, was carried on between himself and Gov. Tanner personally. The governor offered to send troops, in case of a breach of the peace, for the purpose of preserving the peace and protecting property, but refused to send any for the purpose of assisting the company to bring in laborers from other states. To this the president of the company replied that he would work his mines in his own way and defend himself if the governor wouldn't defend him. Immediately following that interview, and on the 11th, the governor wrote Mr. Loucks to the effect that if the company undertook to bring in imported labor they would do so with full knowledge that they were provoking riot and bloodshed, and that therefore they would be morally responsible if not criminally liable for what might happen.

That was the condition at Virden when, on the 12th, near noon, a train loaded with negroes from Alabama, and carrying a heavily armed guard of private detectives, rolled into the village, and, passing the station without stopping, went on toward the stockade. The remainder of the story is the substance of the Associated press dispatches. As the train passed the depot, its character was recognized by the miners, and a gun was fired in the air by one of them as a signal to their associates nearer the stockade, half a mile away, that the imported laborers had arrived. Instantly shots were fired from the train itself into the crowd of miners. Then the miners fired at the train, and were fired at in turn both from the train and from the stockade. The train stopped at the stockade only two minutes, when it pulled out for Springfield; but its departure did not stop the firing from the stockade. Eye-witnesses assert that most of the miners were killed after the departure of the train.

Under orders from Gov. Tanner, a detachment of militia arrived at Virden in the evening. It was under orders to disarm everybody, to preserve the peace, and to protect life and property, but to give no aid in the importation of non-resident laborers. Coming first in contact with

the stockade guards, the officer in command ordered them to throw up their hands, but instead of doing so, they backed into the stockade, holding their revolvers menacingly. The order was repeated but was still disobeyed, when one of the stockade guards was shot, though whether by the troops or not is uncertain. The miners when ordered by the troops to hold up their hands did so, and surrendered their firearms. At the present writing there are no further developments.

An enormous strike is under way on the other side of the Atlantic, in Paris. It began with the poorest paid grade of day laborers, who demanded 60 centimes (12 cents) an hour, for their work. On the 6th, the municipal council undertook to put an end to the strike by offering to make good to contractors the difference between what they were paying and the wages demanded. At first the strikers were inclined to fall in with this proposition and call off the strike; but upon consideration they refused to do so unless the other building guilds were allowed a proportionate increase, whereupon the strike extended from the day laborers to masons, iron workers, stone cutters, truckmen, plumbers, locksmiths, carpenters, joiners, painters, decorators, and other house-building unions. This is the cabled explanation of the strike, and must be accepted with caution. The strike has grown marvelously. On the 8th, of 200,000 house building workmen in the city, 40,000 were on strike. Only 200 then remained at work on the exposition structures and the Metropolitan railway. The strikers act under the direction of socialist leaders.

A general strike was proclaimed on the 7th, and efforts were made to extend it to every branch of industry. The success of these efforts cannot be predicted, but the cable reports the strike as daily spreading. On the 10th the number of strikers had increased from 40,000 to 50,000, and on the 11th the number was still further increased by the decision of the bricklayers and wood carvers to join. To oppose or intimidate the strikers, 11,000 troops have been brought into the city as reinforcements to the regular garrison; and Paris is described as taking on the appearance of a huge camp. It is said to look more warlike than at any time since 1870. Great fears are felt that the strike excitement may merge with that in connec-

tion with the Dreyfus scandal, and precipitate an uncontrollable outburst of popular passion.

The Spanish-American peace commission now convened in Paris has met altogether four times. The first two meetings were reported last week as having been held on the 1st and 3d respectively; the third, pursuant to the adjournment noted last week, was held on the 7th. On this occasion the sitting was brief, lasting less than an hour. What was done has not been officially divulged, and the cabled reports of the meeting sent by special correspondents have proved to be valueless. The only information directly from the meeting room came through an interview on the 8th, with the secretary of the Spanish commission, Senor Ojeda, who said:

The proposals and replies of both countries have been carried on with perfect smoothness, and the American proposals so far have contained nothing that surprised us or gave the least cause for misunderstanding; but that is natural, as they have not gone an inch outside of the terms of the protocol. Spain has accepted, as she could not help it, all the proposals from the American side so far, but the commission is still discussing the terms of peace. The principal question, that in regard to the Philippines, has not yet been taken up.

On the 11th, the fourth meeting of the joint commission took place. It lasted more than two hours. Cabled reports are to the effect that the Spanish commissioners presented the reply of their government to a refusal of the United States to assume any liability for the Spanish-Cuban debt, and that the American commissioners plainly stated that the decision of the American government not to assume that debt is irrevocable. But this meeting, also, was held in secret; and as no official reports have been given out, the published accounts of its doings may be of no more value than those relative to preceding meetings. Adjournment was taken until the 14th, it being apparently the purpose of the commissions to meet regularly in joint session on Tuesdays and Fridays. The American commissioners hold long sessions of their own, daily.

Pending the conclusions of the peace commission, in which the fate of the Philippines is involved, the Philippine republic is making the islands untenable to Spain. The re-

publican troops have invaded Panay, one of the Philippine group to the south of Luzon; and though the Spanish captain general is concentrating a Spanish force there to resist them, he admits that owing to the numbers and enthusiasm of the republicans, resistance is hopeless. At last reports, the Spanish had been badly beaten on the west coast of Panay island, and the republicans were advancing eastward upon Iloilo. Gen. Rios, the acting captain general, had already cabled Madrid, advising that autonomy be granted to the Philippines. Upon the refusal of the Madrid government to accept his advice, he resigned, and a new captain general is said to be now on his way to the islands from Spain.

Aguinaldo does not confine his warfare against Spain to military movements. A diplomat as well as a general, he had sent a letter to the pope, of which we get reports on the 8th, assuring the pope that the Philippine republic will respect all religions, and that catholics need have no fears for their personal safety, while for the security of their property special laws will be enacted in accordance with the principles of civilization.

Puerto Rico is to become American territory on the 18th. The last joint meeting of the evacuation commissions was held at San Juan on the 12th, and in accordance with their agreement, the American flag is to be raised on the 18th.

The commission of naval officers appointed to determine the merits of the Sampson-Schley controversy relative to the destruction of Cervera's fleet on the 3d of July, reported on the 11th. This report decides that the battle was fought and won upon plans prepared by Sampson; that any directing of the movements of ships by Schley was inconsiderable; that the New York had no active part in the fight; that the Brooklyn was not engaged at so close quarters as represented in the first report; that the brunt of the fighting was borne by the Oregon, the Texas and the Iowa; that the New York was more than 9 miles from the Colon when that ship surrendered, and between 4 and 5 miles from the nearest of her sister ships engaged; that the average range of ships most engaged was about a mile and a half; and that

no American ship at any time during the battle was within a mile of an surrendered Spanish ship.

Among the witnesses examined during the past week by the presidential committee for the investigation of the mismanagement of the war were Gen. H. V. Boynton, in command at Camp Thomas, Chickamauga; Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, in command at Jacksonville; Maj. Hersey, of the "rough riders;" Dr. R. Emmet Giffin, chief surgeon at Camp Thomas, and Capt. James C. Balbridge, commissary of subsistence at Jacksonville. Gen. Graham, also, was examined. No privates have yet testified.

Gen. Boynton's testimony was to the effect that brigade and regimental commanders and subordinate officers were responsible for the increase of disease at Camp Thomas, Chickamauga, toward the close of the camp, because they neglected to cover the regimental kitchen and hospital sinks as directed by the surgeon general. Gen. Lee testified that the army ration was abundant and in the main well suited to a tropical climate, and that Jacksonville was a good site for a camp. The health of his troops had been good, only about 2 per cent. having been sick, and he had no complaint to make against the war department. Gen. Greene said that the most flagrant case of neglect that he had seen was in connection with the transports at New York. He had also seen green coffee issued both in Florida and at Manila. While the camp site at San Francisco was bad, he was certain it had not been selected in collusion with railroad interests. In comparison with Turkish and Russian troops, he had found the condition of the Americans favorable at every point. Maj. Hersey testified that the troops were well supplied and well cared for; that Camp Winkoff was the most perfect camp he had ever seen; and that young Tiffany, whose physician had certified that he died of starvation, suffered more from the kindness of his friends after getting to Boston than from any other source. Dr. Giffin's testimony cannot be briefly summarized. Part of it reflected upon, and part tended to exonerate, the war department. He thought the complaints of starvation due to the sparse diet necessary for typhoid fever convalescents. Capt. Balbridge placed the responsibility for well-founded complaints upon the

inexperienced officers of volunteer regiments. Gen. Graham had no complaint to make as to the management of the war department.

While still considering affairs concerning the war with Spain, the government has become involved in difficulties with Minnesota Indians, which give promise of an Indian war. As we went to press last week, it was reported that a collision with a branch of the Chippewas had occurred at Bear island, in Lake Leech, about 70 miles west of Duluth, and that Gen. Bacon had been ambushed and he and his whole command massacred. It appears now, that a fight with the Pillager Indians, a branch of the Chippewas, did occur at Sugar Point, near Bear island, but that there was no ambush nor massacre. In the fight, however, Gen. Bacon lost in killed, 1 commissioned officer, 1 non-commissioned officer, and 2 privates; and in wounded 10 privates. This battle occurred on the 5th. It was renewed on the 6th, when 2 privates were killed and 1 wounded. Besides these, 4 civilians were wounded. The Indians fought from heavy timber and underbrush, but they were driven back, and as Gen. Bacon reported on the 7th, had then scattered in their canoes to the various islands in the region of the fight. In the same dispatch Gen. Bacon reported that he had done all he could, and would return to St. Paul.

Owing to Gen. Bacon's report, the general government revoked an order theretofore made, placing back under the command of Gov. Clough, of Minnesota, the Minnesota volunteers now in the national service who are on furlough at Duluth and St. Paul. But Gov. Clough was not so well satisfied, as were the Washington military authorities, that the Indian trouble was over, and he telegraphed to Adj. Gen. Corbin very sharply. In his telegram he said he did not think, nor did the settlers, that Gen. Bacon had won the victory he reported. On the contrary, it was his opinion that the claim of the Indians that they had won was true. Continuing, he said:

The soldiers are here and are willing and ready to go, but as you have revoked your order of yesterday you can do as you like with your soldiers. The state of Minnesota will try and get along without any assistance from the department in the future.

To an interviewer the governor explained:

If necessary I will issue a call for volunteers, arm them with such guns as I can pick up, and let the government go to the devil. I am tired of doing business with Washington. There is too much red tape about it. Orders are issued one minute and revoked the next. I am not an alarmist, but it is a safe thing to be prepared. It will reassure the settlers and perhaps prevent an outbreak.

Gov. Clough's telegram brought an order from the war department to Gen. Bacon, directing him to confer with the governor of Minnesota, and to station troops at such points in the state as would relieve the people from further anxiety, using for that purpose the Minnesota volunteers if necessary. In consequence of this order, additional regular troops were on the 8th sent to the scene of the disturbance. It was then intended to scatter some 600 regular soldiers near Leech lake; in addition to which Gov. Clough sent out all the state troops that were not in the national service. The situation still remains critical, though the Indians are reported as disposed to enter into a council. Gen. Bacon has issued an ultimatum commanding the Indians to give up the men for whom warrants are held, and threatening to make war upon them if they disobey.

In our report of last week, we gave as the cause of this Indian outbreak an attempt to arrest Indians for making whiskey, but that appears to have been only the immediate occasion of the disturbance. The anterior cause is much more important. These Indians believe that the whites stole 1,000,000 acres of their choicest lands, under cover of the treaty of 1847, upon promises from the government which have never been redeemed. They complain also that their pine forests are denuded of timber for which not one Indian in a hundred gets a dollar; and that white men live in idleness upon large salaries paid out of their money. They further complain that half breeds take fallen timber from their reservation, the right to which had been granted to them, and that the government ignores their appeals. They say, too, that they have already paid \$250,000 for a first estimate of standing green pine and have to pay \$250,000 more for the second estimate now under way, and that they can't see how at that rate they are getting any compensation for their land. The Indians are therefore said by those who

understand them to be tired of civilization and to have fully resolved to return to the warlike habits and customs of their forefathers, defying the government though the last one of them has to lay down his life in doing so.

From an Indian war to politics would not always be a violent transposition, but this week the sea of politics is calm. Beyond a senatorial election in Oregon and a republican convention in Massachusetts, nothing has occurred except the routine of campaigning. The new senator from Oregon is Joseph Simon, president of the Oregon senate. He was elected to the United States senatorship on the 8th by a majority of 18, to fill the vacancy caused by the failure of the legislature heretofore to elect a successor to John H. Mitchell. Mr. Simon, who was born in Germany in 1851, came to Oregon with his parents in 1857, and will be the third Hebrew to occupy a seat in the United States senate. He is a republican, and was at one time a law partner of the late Senator Dolph. The republicans of Massachusetts, in their convention on the 6th, nominated Roger Wolcott for governor.

The newspapers of France and England have been talking war, during the week, over the occupation of Fashoda. It will be remembered that Gen. Kitchener recently took formal possession of Fashoda, on the Nile, by raising the Egyptian flag and leaving a small garrison there. He had found Capt. Marchand of the French army in occupation, and had asserted the sovereignty of Egypt over this territory, offering to transport Marchand to Cairo. Marchand declined to evacuate, and the dispute was left in this condition for diplomatic settlement. After that, France and Great Britain carried on an active correspondence about the matter until the 9th, when the British government published the correspondence. This shows that France declines to withdraw Marchand as a condition precedent to diplomatic negotiation regarding his right to remain there; and that Great Britain, on the other hand, denies that the question of Marchand's withdrawal admits of any discussion or compromise. This deadlock furnishes the occasion to the newspapers of both countries for inferring the possibility of war. The correspondence which the British have pub-

lished, together with the accompanying documents, are reported by American correspondents at London, who have had opportunities to examine it in detail, to show that there is neither military nor diplomatic strength in the French position.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—There is a yellow fever epidemic in Mississippi.

—The battleships Oregon and Iowa sailed for the Philippines on the 12th.

—The emperor and empress of Germany have set out on a trip to Palestine.

—Armour & Co. are arranging to supply American dressed beef to the English market.

—A. Oakey Hall, once the well known mayor of New York, died in that city on the 7th.

—Russia is said to have secured from the Negus of Abyssinia a coaling station on the Red Sea.

—Ex-Congressman Sherman Hoar, of Massachusetts, died at Concord on the 7th, at the age of 38.

—The Rev. Dr. Cunningham Geike, the well known religious writer, died in London on the 6th.

—The triennial council of the episcopal church, begun at Washington last week, is still in session.

—The Norwegian parliament assembled on the 11th. Its sessions, heretofore annual, are now to be semi-annual.

—Victor Napoleon has surrendered his mythical crown to his brother Louis, who thereby becomes the Bonapartist leader in French politics.

—Margaret J. Evans, of Minnesota, has been elected a member of the American board of foreign missions. She is the first woman ever admitted to membership.

—President McKinley arrived at Omaha on the 11th, to visit the exposition on the 12th he delivered an oration to an immense audience in the exposition auditorium.

—The war between Havemeyer and Arbuckle, as sugar refiners, brought down the price of sugar during the week to 4½ cents a pound, which is said to leave no profit in refining.

—The Fabian society of London has arranged to send one of its lecturers, J. W. Martin, to the United States on a lecturing tour. The Fabian society is composed of opportunist socialists.

—A fire that broke out on the 2d in Hankow, the treaty port at the mouth of one of the tributaries of the Yangtse-Kiang river, China, destroyed 10,000 houses, devastating about two miles of built up territory.

—The joint high commission for the adjustment of disputes between the United States and Canada, held its last

session at Quebec on the 10th. The next session will be held on the 1st of November at Washington.

—Two German scientists have discovered a new anesthetic which they call orthoform. Orthoform allays the severest pains from wounds, burns, or raw sores of any kind, the relief continuing for hours; but it has no effect when applied to the unbroken skin.

—On the 5th, Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy presented a collective note to the sultan of Turkey, demanding the withdrawal of Turkish forces from Crete, and an answer within a week. Two days afterward the civil governor of Crete announced that the sultan has decided to accede to the demand.

—The reforms begun by the emperor of China are being recalled. An imperial edict has suppressed the native press and abolished the new methods of examination for public service, while officials who signed memorials in favor of reform have been removed. It is reported, too, that a new emperor has been chosen and will soon be proclaimed.

—The highest mountain in North America is said to have been discovered in Alaska, to the right of the Sushitna river. It has been named Bullshae, and is 20,000 feet high. The claim to this discovery is made by the Eldridge geological Survey, but W. A. Dickey, of Seattle, claims to have made the discovery in 1896, and to have named the mountain "McKinley."

—The Rev. S. S. Craig, formerly a Presbyterian minister at Oakville, Ont., has resigned his charge and started an independent congregation at Toronto. Mr. Craig does not abandon the Presbyterian faith, but he declares his inability to work longer in its ecclesiastical organization. In his letter of withdrawal he says that ecclesiastical organizations, no matter how sacred their origin, degenerate into agencies for the suppression of important truths, and the oppression of the masses. He preached his first sermon as an independent, at Toronto on the 9th, to a large congregation.

—The National Christian Citizenship League has begun a series of noon-day meetings at Chicago, for general instruction in questions of citizenship from the Christian point of view. The first took place at Willard hall on the 10th, and was addressed by Mayor Samuel M. Jones, of Toledo, who has acquired a national reputation by his experiments in Christian business methods and municipal administration. Mr. Jones's subject was, "What Shall the City Own?" and he advocated city ownership of all public utilities that can be administered better by public than by private enterprise. Among these he included the supply of water and light, and telephone service and street-car systems. The next noon-day meeting

of the league, to be held on the 17th, also at Willard hall, is to be addressed by Jane Addams, of Hull House fame, the subject being "The Taint of Institutionalism."

## MISCELLANY

### THE UNIVERSAL PRAYER. For The Public.

All sweet and shy, deep nestles the valley  
'tween the hills,  
With screen of laced branches and song  
of hidden rills;  
Attit upon a berry bush, his note the blue  
bird trills,  
And breath of wild-wood violet the shady  
hollow fills,  
And bird and bush and blossom, on sunny  
days, and days  
When all the clouds are weeping, one short  
petition raise:  
"Our Father, give us freedom! The free-  
dom of the soil!"  
Upon the oaken uplands the sturdy forests  
rise;  
Their many-fingered branches reach up to  
grasp the skies.  
Around the rough and rugged trunks the  
clinging ivy twines,  
And down among the mossy roots the star-  
ry jasmine shines.  
Yet pray the children of the hills, whose  
view is high and wide,  
As pray their lowly kindred that in the val-  
ley hide,  
One short prayer, all embracing, from  
morn till eventide:  
"Our Father, give us freedom! The free-  
dom of the soil!"  
In crowded dens and work shops, where  
bootless labor hides,  
In black and filthy byways, where cease-  
less want abides,  
Where gaunt and hungry mothers weep to  
bring slave babes to earth,  
Fair earth—where want and sorrow receive  
them at their birth,  
There dumbly prays the heart of man for  
what man hath not known:  
"Our Father, give us freedom to shelter  
each his own!"  
And Nature's God makes answer: "Free-  
dom is of the Soil!"

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

### DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE QUES- TIONS BEFORE US?

It is incumbent upon every American citizen to be a diligent student of the country's affairs in the present crisis. The ideas of imperialism and republicanism are coming into conflict before the people. It is a universally admitted theory that ideas are more powerful than the sword, and here is woman's opportunity.

Every woman should be well informed upon the difference between these two basic principles of government. This necessity was vividly impressed upon me a few days since. While receiving a call from a friend who had spent the winter in Honolulu, upon the conversation naturally turned upon the annexation of Hawaii. She

stated that she had had several conversations with President Dole and other officers of the government, and that they had convinced her of the need in which they stood of the protection of the United States. An intense fear pervades the American portion of the population that some European power might make a conquest of the islands, and that they would thus lose self-government. To the question: "Then you would favor the annexation of Hawaii?" the answer returned was: "Most assuredly." "And how would you have it come into the union, as a colony or a territory?" The reply to this latter question was: "What is the difference?" Whether this policy of insular annexation be carried out or not became a matter which sank into insignificance in my own mind compared with the great need that women who occupy high social positions and converse so glibly, should learn to think more deeply and talk more wisely and intelligently.—Mrs. Louisa Southworth, in Union Signal.

### APPALACHIAN AMERICA.

An extract from an article on University Extension in Kentucky, by William Goodell Frost, Ph. D., published in "The Outlook."

Externally the inhabitants of the southern mountains are not, at first glance, prepossessing. Their homespun garb, often in tatters, rude speech and shuffling gait might lead us to class them with the "poor white trash." But there could be no greater mistake. The landless, luckless "poor white," degraded by actual competition with slave labor, is far removed in spirit from the narrow-horizoned but proud owner of a mountain "boundary." The "poor white" is actually degraded; the mountain man is a person not yet graded up.

The mountaineer is to be regarded as a survival. From this point of view his variations from the regulation type of the American citizen are both interesting and instructive. In his speech you will soon detect the flavor of Chaucer; in his home you shall see the fireside industries of past ages; his very homicides are an honest survival of Saxon temper—in a word, he is our contemporary ancestor!

The causes which have retarded his development are not far to seek. Take the circle of southern states east of the great river, and each of them, except Florida and Mississippi, has a mountain back yard of great proportions. Bunched together, these mountain fractions constitute one of the largest horseback areas on the globe. From Harper's Ferry to the iron hills of Birmingham, 200 miles and more

in width—"knobs," caves, ridges, forests—stretches this inland empire which we are beginning to recognize by the name of Appalachian America. It has no coast line like Greece, no arms of the sea like Scotland, no inland lakes or navigable rivers like Switzerland. Is it any wonder that pioneer conditions have lingered in a country where the only highways are the beds of streams? The whole south has been very slow about "coming to town." The governor of one of these states recently said that a quarter of the people had never seen the courthouse in their own county. And the people on "Cutshin" or "No Bizness Branch" have a good excuse. Progress must be slow in a land of saddle-bags.

#### HAWAIIAN LAND TENURE.

According to Senator Cullom, the Hawaiian commission will not recommend many changes in the land laws of our first insular colony.

These laws are peculiar. They are supposed to prevent the ownership of large tracts of land by natural or artificial persons, as well as speculation in land. No person can lawfully hold to exceed 100 acres. It is stated that the prevailing custom is to give the farmer a 99-year lease of the ground he cultivates or occupies. This implies that the title for the most part is in the state, which makes some approximation to the plan advocated by the late Henry George, though probably the state does not exact anything like the full rental value of the land.

The commission will recommend that homestead laws be enacted, we are told, and that under certain conditions the occupant of land under these laws shall receive a title deed to the same. Some details of the proposed homestead scheme are given, but they are unimportant as compared with the scheme itself.

The most serious objection to making an experiment of the Henry George plan in our continental union is that it cannot be done on such a scale or under such conditions as to test its merits without confiscating the capital invested in land or forcing the owners to part with it upon terms prescribed by the government.

But from what Senator Cullom says of Hawaii we are to infer that the land is for the most part the property of the government, or the public, already, and there is nothing to hinder the application of the George plan as to all public land as fast at least as existing leases expire. It could be applied at once without any such upheaval as would attend the experiment here, be-

cause there no private capital is invested in the land itself, but only in the improvements.

It may be seriously questioned, therefore, whether it would be wise to abandon the existing system and give title deeds. It would seem desirable to take advantage of the opportunity which is now presented to try the George experiment in an isolated locality where its merits may be tested. The present system is not a subject of complaint in Hawaii and it certainly should not be disturbed until after a more thorough investigation than it has been possible for the commission to make.

It may be found that the limitation of individual occupancy is more nominal than real and that the wealthy planters of sugar cane and coffee have discovered ways of evading the laws as the engineers of our trusts have done. Here is a field of inquiry which may be found rich in economic instruction and it should not be disturbed until it has been thoroughly and honestly explored.—Editorial in Chicago Chronicle, October 8.

#### MR. DOOLEY ON THE INDIAN WAR.

"Gin'ral Sherman was wan iv th' smartest men we iver had," said Mr. Dooley. "He said so many bright things. 'Twas him said: 'War is hell,' an' that's wan iv th' finest sayin's I know annything about. 'War is hell,' 'tis a thrue wurred an' a fine sintiment.' An' Gin'ral Sherman says: 'Th' only good Indyun is a dead Indyun,' An' that's a good sayin', too. So, be th' powers, we've started in again to improve th' race, an' if we can get in Gatlin' guns enough before th' winter's snows we'll tur-rn thim Chipeways into a cimitry branch iv th' Young Men's Christyan Association. We will so.

"Ye see, Hinnissy, th' Indyun is bound f'r to give way to th' onward march iv white civilization. You an' me, Hinnissy, is th' white civilization. I come along an' I find ol' Snakes-in-His-Gaiters livin' quiet an' dacint in a new frame house. Thinks I: 'Tis a shame f'r to lave this savage man in possession iv this fine abode, an' him not able f'r to vote an' without a frind on th' polis foorce.' So says I: 'Snakes,' I says, 'get along,' says I, 'I want yer house an' ye best move out west iv th' thracks an' dig a hole f'r ye'erself,' I says. 'Divvle th' fut will I step out iv this house,' says Snakes. 'I built it an' I have th' law on me side,' he says. 'F'r why should I take Mary Ann, an' Terence an' Honoria, an' Robert Im-

mitt Snakes an' all me little Snakes an' rustle out west iv th' thracks,' he says, 'far frim th' bones iv me ancestors,' he says, 'an' beyond th' watherpipe extinsion,' he says. 'Because,' says I, 'I am th' walkin' dilygate iv white civilization,' I says. 'I'm jist as civilized as you,' says Snakes. 'I wear pants,' he says, 'an' a plug hat,' he says. 'Ye might wear tin pairs,' says I, 'an' all at wanst,' I says, 'an' ye'd still be a savage,' says I, 'an' I'd be civilized,' I says, 'if I hadn't on so much as a bangle bracelet,' I says. 'So get out,' says I, 'f'r th' pianny movers is outside r-ready to go to wurruk,' I says.

"Well, Snakes he fires a shtove lid at me an' I go down to th' polis station an' says I: 'Loot,' I says, 'they'se a dhrunken Indyun not voting up near th' mills an' he's carryin' on outrageous an' he won't let me hang me pitchers on his wall,' says I. 'Vile savage,' says th' loot. 'I'll tache him to rayspiet th' rules iv civilization,' he says. An' he takes out a wagon load an' goes afther Snakes. Well, me frind Snakes gives him battle, an' knowin' th' premises well he's able to put up a gr-reat fight, but afther awhile they rip him away an' have him in th' pattral wagon with a man settin' on his head. An' thim he's put undher bonds to kape the peace, an' they sind him out west iv th' thracks an' I move into th' house an' tear out th' front an' start a faro bank. Some day whin I get tired or th' Swedes dhrive me out or Schwartzmeister makes his lunch too sthrong f'r competition, I'll go afther Snakes again.

"Th' on'y hope f'r th' Indyun is to put his house on rollers an' kep a team hitched to it, an' whin he sees a white man to start f'r th' settin' sun. He's rooned whin he has a cellar. He ought to put all th' plugged dollars that he gets from th' agent an' be pickin' blueberries into rowlin' stock. If he knew annything about balloons he'd have a chanst, but we white men, Hinnissy, has all th' balloons. But, anyhow, he's doomed, as Hogan says. Th' onward march iv th' white civilization with mortgedges an' other modhren improvements is slowly but surely, as Hogan says, chasin' him out, an' th' last iv him'll be livin' in a divin' bell somewhere out in the Pac-ific ocean."

"Well," said Mr. Hennessy, the stout philanthropist, "I think so, an' thim again, I dinnaw. I don't think we threat thim r-right. If I was th' government I'd take what they got, but I'd say: 'Here, take this tin dollar bill an' goout an' dhrink ye-ersilf to death,' I'd say. They ought to have some show."

"Well," said Mr. Dooley, "if ye feel that way ye ought to go an' inlist as an Indyun."—Chicago Evening Journal.

#### THE UN-AMERICAN POLICY.

The discussion of the future policy of the United States is increasing in interest—the opponents of expansion, as the New York Times has pointed out, having the advantage of character and ability. In the current number of Harper's Monthly is a clear and strong argument in behalf of the maintenance of American institutions by ex-Secretary Carlisle. It follows and supplements a recent article published in the same periodical by Mr. James Bryce, whose warning against the perils of colonial expansion is tempered by the natural self-restraint of a foreigner speaking to us concerning our own affairs, but is also quick with the intelligent interest which Mr. Bryce, beyond any other foreigner, has in our republic. On the same side have ranged themselves Mr. Carl Schurz, Mr. George F. Edmunds, Senator Caffery and Mr. Cleveland, among other Americans, and Mr. John Morley and other leading liberals, the long-time friends of the United States, among Englishmen. On the other side we have some exuberant and restless young adventurers, some politicians who find phrase-making and demagogy easier than thinking, some editors who mistake cerebral excitement for patriotism and noise for statesmanship, some commercial adventurers who are eagerly interested in the proposition that the government shall buy markets for them with blood and treasure, and some Englishmen, like Mr. Chamberlain, who realize that if they can only persuade the United States to take the Philippines, Great Britain will be sure to have this country for an ally in any trouble that may arise in China between herself and Russia. Surely, if character and ability ever lend weight to one side of a controversy, there is good reason to ask the country to pause and consider before plunging into a departure toward world power, world responsibilities and world troubles, on the ground of the intellectual and moral differences between the opponents and advocates of expansion.

There is another reason for listening to the opponents of this new movement than the merits of their arguments. They are more consistently American than the advocates of expansion. They are the champions of the fundamental principles of the republic, the hopeful and confident

believers in the soundness of the democratic form of government, and in the high achievements of its future. The advocates of expansion, on the other hand, are proving their loss of faith in democratic institutions and their distrust of the American experiment. They denounce as old-fashioned and outgrown Washington's and Jefferson's counsels against mingling our affairs and our destinies with those of monarchical Europe. They hold that the Declaration of Independence erred in asserting it to be a "self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." They scout the word of Lincoln, and insist that "government of the people, by the people and for the people" has perished from the earth, notwithstanding Gettysburg and Bunker Hill. Whether they like it or not—and they profess not to like it—they are really imperialists, for they are endeavoring to overturn the democratic form of government, to destroy the ideals of the republic, to revolutionize American politics by changing the United States from a popular self-government to a power ruling over alien and unwilling peoples, who will not be free and independent, who will be subjects, who will not have a voice in making the laws by which they are governed, and who will be taxed without being represented. And yet these enemies of American institutions, these rebels against the policy which has made the United States what they are, and which has built up American citizenship as it exists, have the insolence to declare that those who favor the maintenance of these institutions and that policy are "un-American." In other words, they recognize the character of the task in which they are engaged by objecting to the labels which properly describe them, and by trying to attach one of them to their opponents. Illustrations of the old fable of the thief who sought to turn attention from himself to his honest pursuers are constantly cropping up in modern life, but no renewal of the old trick within our memory is quite so bold as this one made by those Americans who are so tired of their government and its foundation principles that they desire to join the mediaeval procession, the head of which, for the moment, is the tsar of Russia.—From Editorial in Harper's Weekly of October 8.

France and China are both in trouble. And, oddly enough, the people with its civilization ground to a razor-edge and the people without civilization, as we use the word, are in the same kind of

trouble. Each has balked in the road of Progress and refuses to move on, and the moderns are no less mulish than the ancients. China wants to preserve her inertia and seclusion; yet, little by little, she is being made to catch up with the world, partly by outside influence and partly by native impulse. France wants no less to preserve the traditions of a dead time, of a time when simple justice to the individual counted as nothing against a kind of false honor that was the chief glory of kings; and she, too, is being pushed on like China, partly by the outer world and partly by her own struggling ideal of honesty. Each has got to move in obedience to a law as unbending as the law of gravitation. Since our first parents ate from the tree of Knowledge in the world's greatest fable, no man or nation has been able to evade the penalty. If you eat of the apple you must live up to what you get from it or suffer. France and China are trying not to. Their struggles and their predestined failures will make some lively and instructive reading for the history books.—Editorial in Puck.

#### THE NEW CONSCIENCE.

An extract from a commencement oration, given at the Kansas state agricultural college, June 9, 1898, by Prof. George D. Herron.

The race is becoming sensible of a life and destiny of its own; it is a race life and a race destiny in which all individuals are to share, yet which is something altogether more than the mere sum of individual lives and destinies, just as a college is infinitely more than the faculty and students and educational machinery that happen to be present in any given year. The new conscience is teaching the individual that his life is a function of the race life, and that he can fulfill his individuality only through fulfilling this function. "A man passes like a traveler through the world," says one of Henryk Sienkiewicz' Polish knights, "and should not be concerned for himself, but only for the commonwealth, which is and must be without end. Amen!"

The responsibility of the individual for the whole human life, and the responsibility of the whole for each individual, is the distinct mark and quality of the new conscience. The individual feels himself enslaved and oppressed in the enslavement and oppression of his brethren; he feels himself guilty of his brother's blood in every custom or system or necessity that makes for poverty and the solace of vice, ignorance and helpless toil; he feels himself a traitor in the prosperity which political debauchery builds on

the prostrate bodies of citizens, a destroyer in the luxury that feasts on the flesh of boys and girls, of women and men. No longer is it possible for men to be content to have while their brothers have not. Superior privileges of any sort now carry with them the sense of shame. The disgrace of wealth, the puerility of culture, the corruption that inheres in the possession of power, are making themselves widely and deeply felt. There are few so lost as to escape the feeling that superiority is a thing to be expiated in social sacrifice. Thus the might and right of the social problem, with the immensity and intricacy thereof, is matched by the honest and searching subtlety of the new conscience. . . .

When I call this conscience Christian, I do not use the word in any professional or pietistic sense; I do not mean that any particular form of religion is, or need be, accepted. This conscience does not come in the names or terms of Christianity; it comes without observation, almost as a new religion springing up from the human soil. Its most manifest activities and evolutions are unconscious of any relation to him we call Christ. The truest Christian conscience of to-day utterly rejects that which is preached and professed as Christianity. Many things that are done in Christ's name are the things which Christ stood against, and the things he stood for are done by many who call themselves materialist or agnostic. The atheist or profligate with human sympathies and social ideals is profoundly Christian in comparison with the professional Christian of faultless morality who conserves only his religious interests and the existing order; the latter is in fact solidly atheistic. We speak of our free school as secular; but it is probably the most concrete social expression of Jesus' idea.

By the term Christian conscience I mean that quality of conscience and sympathy which suffers not a man to rest short of some altar, however rude, on which he offers his life for the common service, the social good. He refuses to drink of the fruit of the vine until he can drink it in fellowship with all his brethren in the full-come kingdom of God. Therefore doth the father love him, because he lays down his life for the sheep.

Now that which makes the ethical tragedy of the present moment is the chasm between the existing civilization and the new conscience. Civilization no longer represents the conscience of the individuals who must find therein their work. The facts and

forces which now organize industry and so-called justice violate the best instincts of mankind. The social crisis discloses conscience and civilization becoming separate entities. Civilization affords no machinery by which the Christ-spirit can express itself in things. This best force in civilization is helpless to effectuate itself in facts. The highest moral reason of the world can find no way to enforce its dictates. The best faith of the world offers no method by which the individual can obey its principles. Without regard to his conscience, the economic system involves a man in the guilt of the moral and physical death of his brothers; their blood cries to him from the adulterated and monopolized food he eats, from the sweat shop clothes he wears, from his educational advantages, his special privileges, his social opportunities. Civilization denies to man that highest right under the sun—the right to live a guiltless life.

#### PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

A year and a half ago Prof. Hadley, of Yale, made an address on railroads before the Twentieth Century club in Boston. He argued against public ownership on financial grounds, and because, as I noted his thought, "England and the United States, the most progressive and enlightened nations, have private roads, and low grade peoples have public roads."

President Mead called upon me, without warning, for a five-minute's reply. . . . I thought the statistics of rates and costs were capable of a very different interpretation, if all the circumstances were taken into account, and I could not see the propriety of calling the Germans a low-grade people. England and America may be the most progressive and enlightened nations, but that does not prove all their institutions and conditions to be good. They have more slums and sensational newspapers and stock gamblers and suicides than the "low grade" peoples, but it does not follow that these things are good. Some of the states of Germany and other "low grade" countries started with private railroads, but as they advanced in civilization and experience they came more and more to the conclusion that public roads were best. They tried both ways and found the public plan superior. England and America have only tried one plan, and the continuance of the private system is chiefly due, not to superior civilization, but to the fact that the railroad corporations have greater power over the governments than they had in the

"low grade" countries. The main point I tried to make, however, was that the discussion should rest chiefly on planes above the financial. Economy is good (and it is with the public system), but impartial, undiscriminating, efficient service and the wages and conditions of labor are the most important railroad matters. Large classes of railroad employes are reported by the United States commissioners as making only \$123, \$150 and \$300 per year per individual. The average receipts of all the railroad employes, high and low, are only about \$500 a year, while the letter carriers get \$1,000 and Boston policemen \$1,200 for fewer hours and more agreeable service. If the railroads were made public property, under reasonable civil service rules, employment would be more secure, the hours shorter, the wages higher, the service safer (through automatic couplers, block switches, better-paid labor, etc.), and the men might average as much as the carriers, or double their present wage, and thousands would be able to have comfortable homes of their own instead of getting only half or a quarter of a man's fair pay. Nine hundred dollars or \$1,000 I thought was little enough for a man to have to keep a family and raise and educate his children. The work of a man is worth \$1,000, and he ought to have it. No competent worker ought to be asked to give a year of his life for less, and the fact that the government would see that the men it employed received enough to have good homes and educate their children properly, was one of the strongest reasons for the public ownership of railroads. Good citizens, happy homes, well educated children are worth more than anything else. Civilization is with public ownership, because it tends to manhood, the fair diffusion of wealth, and a wider cooperation.

Edward Atkinson followed me upon the floor, and said it was dangerous to hold out the hope of doubling the average wage of railroad employes. Prof. Hadley also said it was dangerous doctrine to talk of paying the railway men as much as the carriers.

Dangerous doctrine? Yes, it is dangerous; but dangerous to what? To private monopolies and unjust profits—to the wastes of the compound, competitive, monopolistic system we enjoy to-day; to the trusts and combines, and the favorites that get free passes, and special rates and rebates and all the inequities and discriminations that accompany private railroading. Dangerous to whom? To Wall street gamblers in railroad stocks, to transportation

lobbies in our legislatures and at Washington; to railroad millionaires, and all the multitude of those who are not willing that others should have the privileges they enjoy or receive as much wealth as they think needful for themselves. Dangerous? Yes, but not to anything that ought not to be in danger. The dangers of the doctrine are part of its blessing—it is dangerous to injustice, and to those who live by it, or cling to it. It is not dangerous to true economy, or to good citizenship, or democracy, or just and enlightened treatment of labor. Dangerous to say that an able bodied man, working every day in the year, ought to receive enough to have a home of his own, and raise his children in comfort and culture—think of it!

It seems to me more dangerous by far to oppose the elevation of labor than to favor it. "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was deemed a dangerous book in the south, and it was—to the slaveholders. But it was not dangerous to justice and brotherhood. It was only dangerous to wrong and to men and institutions linked with it. And so it will be with every effort to improve the condition of those who do the world's work, and determine, in their home and business life, the character and thought of future generations.—Prof. Frank Parsons, of Boston University, in *The Kingdom*.

That some people may live without work others must work without living.—Puck.

Journalism was once a profession; then it became a trade; to-day it's a crime.—Life.

"The American soldier has been over-estimated!"

"What? The American soldier can whip anybody!"

"Oh, yes; but some folks evidently thought he could eat anything."—Puck.

Nature's live growths crowd out and rive dead matter. Ideas strangle statutes. Pulse-beats wear down granite, whether piled in jails or capitols. The people's hearts are the only title-deeds, after all.—Wendell Phillips.

Perhaps I do not know what I was made for; but one thing I certainly never was made for; and that is, to put principles on and off at the dictation of a party, as a lackey changes his livery at his master's command.—Horace Mann.

When I hear a man complaining that some cause which he has at heart will be put back for years by a speech or a book, I suspect that his attachment to it is a prejudice; that he has no con-

sciousness of standing on a rock.—William Ellery Channing.

"I don't like you running about to strange kirks in that way. Not that I object to you hearing Mr. Dunlop, but I'm sure ye widna like yer ain sheep straying away into strange pastures." Rory—"I widna care a grain, sir, if it was better grass."—Glasgow Times.

THE POOR MAN'S CONSOLATION.

I'm thankful that the sun and moon  
Are both hung up so high  
That no rich robber's hand can stretch  
And pull them from the sky.  
If they hung low, I have no doubt,  
Some corporation ass  
Would legislate to take them down,  
And light the world with gas.

I'm thankful that the shining stars  
Are far beyond our reach,  
And that the rolling planets, too,  
Are deaf to human speech.  
If they were near, I'm very sure,  
Rich men would own the skies,  
And manage this whole universe  
By private enterprise.

I'm thankful that the God of all,  
Whose laws we must obey,  
Has changed His plan for making man  
By shaping him from clay;  
If He had not, it's very clear,  
'Twould be a doleful case,  
Some man would form a big clay trust,  
And stop the human race.  
—Mrs. Samuel Gregg, in the Dedham  
(Mass.) Transcript.

The stars come nightly to the sky;  
The tidal wave unto the sea;  
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,  
Can keep my own from me.

In one of its advertisements the Cass Real Estate company of New York says: "Every altruistic thought, every religious emotion, every good impulse of mind or of soul, adds to the value of Manhattan Island real estate."—The Eagle and the Serpent.

If the French army had prevented a revision of the Dreyfus sentence, or if it can now prevent a decision that will be accepted as just, the republic of France is under a military tyranny compared with which the empires of the kaiser and tsar are free and enlightened governments. — Harper's Weekly.

Uncle (to the children, who have just had a dose of codliver oil all around)—"Well, do you like codliver oil?" Children—"O, no; but mamma gives us five cents for every spoonful." Uncle—"And then do you buy something nice?" Children—"No, mamma puts it into the savings bank." Uncle—"And then you buy something by and by?" Children—"No, mamma buys more codliver oil with it."—Fliegende Blaetter.

A well-known inventor and manufac-

turer, in answer to questions about some beautiful and shapely machines which he had turned out, has told me that it is his practice, and that of the best American inventors, to seek forms for their machines that are the most elegant in their proportions, knowing that in doing so they are choosing at the same time the strongest and most economical shapes. He studied the proportions and forms of animals and plants as his models of structure, and his ideal was to get a machine to look as though "it had naturally grown that way." — W. A. Rogers, in Harper's Weekly.

He had sat at the other end of the sofa for about an hour, and she was getting rather tired of it.

"It would be little loss," she said at last, "if the czar's proposal to disarm were made to include you."

It sometimes takes something of this nature to jar a young man into a realization of the fact that arms are made for use.—Chicago Post.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Single copies, delivered at office.  | \$0.02 |
| Quantities delivered at office, per 100.   | 1.00   |
| Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid.                                       | .03    |
| Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100. | 2.00   |
| In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100.                     | 1.25   |

The following pamphlets are now ready:

- 1. A Business Agency (from THE PUBLIC of Sept. 10, 1898), by Louis F. Post.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 316 American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069) Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St West.